

## REL Southwest Ask A REL Response

April 2020

### Question:

*What research exists on the effectiveness of programs designed to prevent school violence, assess the threat of violence, and prevent bullying?*

### Response:

Thank you for the question you submitted to our REL Reference Desk. We have prepared the following memo with research references to help answer your question. For each reference, we provide an abstract, excerpt, or summary written by the study's author or publisher. Following an established Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Southwest research protocol, we conducted a search for research reports as well as descriptive study articles on what studies exist on the effectiveness of programs to prevent school violence, assess the threat of violence, and prevent bullying. Accordingly, the studies below are separated by topic.

We have not evaluated the quality of references and the resources provided in this response. We offer them only for your reference. Also, we searched the references in the response from the most commonly used resources of research, but they are not comprehensive, and other relevant references and resources may exist. References provided are listed in alphabetical order, not necessarily in order of relevance. We do not include sources that are not freely available to the requestor.

### Research References

#### Violence Prevention

De La Rue, L., Polanin, J. R., Espelage, D. L., & Pigott, T. D. (2017). A meta-analysis of school-based interventions aimed to prevent or reduce violence in teen dating relationships. *Review of Educational Research*, 87(1), 7–34. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1132720>

*From the ERIC abstract:* “The incidence of violence in dating relationships has a significant impact on young people, including decreased mental and physical health. This review is the first to provide a quantitative synthesis of empirical evaluations of school-based programs implemented in middle and high schools that sought to prevent or reduce incidents of dating violence. After a systematic search and screening procedure, a meta-analysis of 23 studies was used to examine the effects of school-based programs. Results indicated school-based programs influence dating violence knowledge ( $g\text{-bar} = 0.22$ , 95% confidence interval [0.05, 0.39]) and attitudes ( $g\text{-bar} = 0.14$ , 95% confidence interval

[0.10, 0.19]); however, to date, the results for dating violence perpetration and victimization indicate programs are not affecting these behaviors to a significant extent. The results of this review are encouraging, but they also highlight the need for modifications to dating violence prevention programs including the incorporation of skill-building components and a need to address the role of bystanders.”

Espelage, D. L., Low, S., Polanin, J. R., & Brown, E. C. (2013). The impact of a middle school program to reduce aggression, victimization, and sexual violence. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 53*(2), 180–186. Retrieved from <https://www.academia.edu/27336416>

*From the abstract:* “Purpose: To evaluate the impact of the Second Step: Student Success Through Prevention (SS-SSTP) Middle School Program on reducing youth violence including peer aggression, peer victimization, homophobic name calling, and sexual violence perpetration and victimization among middle school sixth-grade students. Methods: The study design was a nested cohort (sixth graders) longitudinal study. We randomly assigned 18 matched pairs of 36 middle schools to the SS-SSTP or control condition. Teachers implemented 15 weekly lessons of the sixth-grade curriculum that focused on social emotional learning skills, including empathy, communication, bully prevention, and problem-solving skills. All sixth graders (n = 3,616) in intervention and control conditions completed self-report measures assessing verbal/relational bullying, physical aggression, homophobic name calling, and sexual violence victimization and perpetration before and after the implementation of the sixth-grade curriculum. Results: Multilevel analyses revealed significant intervention effects with regard to physical aggression. The adjusted odds ratio indicated that the intervention effect was substantial; individuals in intervention schools were 42% less likely to self-report physical aggression than students in control schools. We found no significant intervention effects for verbal/relational bully perpetration, peer victimization, homophobic teasing, and sexual violence. Conclusions: Within a 1-year period, we noted significant reductions in self-reported physical aggression in the intervention schools. Results suggest that SS-SSTP holds promise as an efficacious prevention program to reduce physical aggression in adolescent youth.”

Fagan, A. A., & Catalano, R. F. (2013). What works in youth violence prevention: A review of the literature. *Research on Social Work Practice, 23*(2), 141–156. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1009397>. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/258184047>

*From the ERIC abstract:* “Objectives: Given the high rates at which adolescents engage in violence, the strong link between adolescent and adult violence, and the financial and social costs of violence, the prevention of violent behavior is a national priority. Methods: The authors conducted a comprehensive review of evaluations utilizing quasi-experimental or experimental research designs to assess violence reduction. Results: Seventeen interventions were identified as producing a significant reduction in youth-perpetrated physical or sexual violence. The interventions were varied in terms of targeted age groups, content, strategies, and length of programming, and included programs focusing on individual, peer, school, family, and community factors. Conclusions: Widespread use of effective interventions such as these, across settings and

development, and implemented with fidelity, is likely to substantially reduce youth violence. Continued evaluation of violence prevention programming is also needed to increase the number of options available for replication and establish effects on diverse populations.”

Hahn, R., Fuqua-Whitley, D., Wethington, H., Lowy, J., Crosby, A., Fullilove, M., et al. (2007). Effectiveness of universal school-based programs to prevent violent and aggressive behavior: Systematic review. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 33(2S), S114–S129. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/6164413>

*From the abstract:* “Universal, school-based programs, intended to prevent violent behavior, have been used at all grade levels from pre-kindergarten through high school. These programs may be targeted to schools in a high-risk area—defined by low socioeconomic status or high crime rate—and to selected grades as well. All children in those grades receive the programs in their own classrooms, not in special pull-out sessions. According to the criteria of the systematic review methods developed for the Guide to Community Preventive Services (Community Guide), there is strong evidence that universal, school-based programs decrease rates of violence among school-aged children and youth. Program effects were consistent at all grade levels. An independent, recently updated meta-analysis of school-based programs confirms and supplements the Community Guide findings.”

Joppa, M. C., Rizzo, C. J., Nieves, A. V., & Brown, L. K. (2016). Pilot investigation of the Katie Brown Educational Program: A school-community partnership. *Journal of School Health*, 86(4), 288–297. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1092397>. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4777965/>

*From the ERIC abstract:* “Background: Schools in the United States are increasingly being urged to address the problem of adolescent dating violence (DV) with their students. Given the limited time available to implement prevention programming during the school day, brief programs are needed. The purpose of this study was to test the efficacy of a widely disseminated, brief community-based DV prevention program in partnership with a nonprofit community agency. Methods: We conducted a randomized waitlist control trial of a 5-session DV prevention program (active condition) compared to health class as usual (waitlist control condition). Participants were 225 10th-grade students with a recent dating history in a large public school in New England. Surveys were administered at baseline, end of program, and 3 months postintervention. Results: After completing the program, students in the active condition reported significantly lower approval of aggression, healthier dating attitudes, and more DV knowledge. These effects were sustained at 3-month follow-up. In addition, students in the active condition reported significantly less emotional/verbal and total DV perpetration and victimization at 3-month follow-up. Conclusions: These findings suggest that a brief, community-based DV prevention curriculum can promote change in behaviors, attitudes, and knowledge among high school students.”

Peterson, S. E., Williams, R. C., Myer, R. A., & Tinajero, J. V. (2016). Experiences of middle-level students, teachers, and parents in the Do the Write Thing violence prevention

program. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 6(1), 66–89.  
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1132267>

*From the ERIC abstract:* “We examined experiences of participants in “Do the Write Thing” national violence prevention program for middle-level students. Using mixed methods, we conducted surveys and focus groups with students, parents, and teachers who attended the program’s National Recognition Week in Washington, DC. Results revealed important affective, behavioral, and cognitive impacts on participants, including improved relationships, increased understanding of violence, and commitment to reduce violence. Participants from cities where insufficient time and resources were devoted to the project did not experience significant change. Teachers reported developing greater empathy for their students and making substantial changes in their teaching, providing support for students and infusing activities addressing violence into their curriculum. Recommendations are made for increased program support and future research.”

Roberts, L., Yeomans, P., & Ferro-Almeida, S. (2007). Project WIN evaluation shows decreased violence and improved conflict resolution skills for middle school students. *RMLE Online: Research in Middle Level Education*, 30(8), 1–14.  
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ801116>

*From the ERIC abstract:* “We believe the problems of school violence are linked to competition and bullying in school culture. We also believe that by fostering more cooperation and more compassion in school culture, we can reduce school violence. One of the ways to develop school culture is to implement conflict resolution training. In the current study, we introduced conflict resolution training at a middle school. We chose to focus on middle school students because these are the years when bullying is especially prevalent in school culture. As a team of researchers and educators, we piloted a conflict resolution program, entitled Project WIN: Working out Integrated Negotiations, in a low-income, urban middle school in southeast Pennsylvania. The evaluation showed the program decreased reported violence and increased students' abilities to apply conflict resolution tools in hypothetical conflict situations. Specifically, the students learned to transform competitive situations into cooperative ones. Moreover, findings indicated greater competence in conflict-with-a-friend, as contrasted to conflict-with-a-classmate. We considered these results in the context of other work in this area, especially the Peacemakers model by David and Roger Johnson at the University of Minnesota.”

Shuval, K., Pillsbury, C. A., Cavanaugh, B., McGruder, L., McKinney, C. M., Massey, Z., et al. (2010). Evaluating the impact of conflict resolution on urban children’s violence-related attitudes and behaviors in New Haven, Connecticut, through a community-academic partnership. *Health Education Research*, 25(5), 757–768.  
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ897810>. Retrieved from  
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/44575400>

*From the ERIC abstract:* “Numerous schools are implementing youth violence prevention interventions aimed at enhancing conflict resolution skills without evaluating their effectiveness. Consequently, we formed a community-academic partnership between a New Haven community-based organization and Yale’s School of Public

Health and Prevention Research Center to examine the impact of an ongoing conflict resolution curriculum in New Haven elementary schools, which had yet to be evaluated. Throughout the 2007-08 school year, 191 children in three schools participated in a universal conflict resolution intervention. We used a quasi-experimental design to examine the impact of the intervention on participants' likelihood of violence, conflict self-efficacy, hopelessness and hostility. Univariate and multivariable analyses were utilized to evaluate the intervention. The evaluation indicates that the intervention had little positive impact on participants' violence-related attitudes and behavior. The intervention reduced hostility scores significantly in School 1 ( $P$  less than 0.01; Cohen's  $d = 0.39$ ) and hopelessness scores in School 3 ( $P = 0.05$ , Cohen's  $d = 0.52$ ); however, the intervention decreased the conflict self-efficacy score in School 2 ( $P = 0.04$ ; Cohen's  $d = 0.23$ ) and was unable to significantly change many outcome measures. The intervention's inability to significantly change many outcome measures might be remedied by increasing the duration of the intervention, adding additional facets to the intervention and targeting high-risk children."

Silvia, S., Blitstein, J., Williams, J., Ringwalt, C., Dusenbury, L., & Hansen, W. (2011). *Impacts of a violence prevention program for middle schools: Findings after 3 years of implementation* (NCEE 2011-4018). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED519881>

*From the ERIC abstract:* "This is the second and final report summarizing findings from an impact evaluation of a violence prevention intervention for middle schools. This report provides findings from the second and third years of the 3-year intervention. The U.S. Department of Education (ED) contracted with RTI International and its subcontractors, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation (PIRE) and Tanglewood Research, Inc., to conduct an evaluation of a hybrid intervention model that combines a curriculum-based program, Responding in Peaceful and Positive Ways (RiPP [Meyer and Northup 2002a, 2002b, 2006]), and a whole-school approach, Best Behavior (Sprague and Golly 2005). The combined intervention was administered over the course of 3 successive years. Using a randomized control trial design (with entire schools randomly assigned either to receive the intervention or not), the evaluation assessed the intervention's effects on both the full sample of students as well as on students at high risk for committing violence."

Sullivan, T. N., Sutherland, K. S., Farrell, A. D., & Taylor, K. A. (2015). An evaluation of Second Step: What are the benefits for youth with and without disabilities? *Remedial and Special Education*, 36(5), 286–298. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1074021>. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275642497>

*From the ERIC abstract:* "The impact of a school-based violence prevention program, Second Step, on peer victimization and aggression, and emotion regulation was evaluated among 457 sixth graders. A cluster-randomized trial was conducted with classrooms randomly assigned to intervention ( $n = 14$ ) or control ( $n = 14$ ) conditions. A repeated measures analysis of covariance on each measure was conducted using random effects. Several intervention effects were moderated by gender and disability status. Teacher-rated relational victimization at posttest decreased for students with disabilities in



intervention but not control classrooms. Students without disabilities in intervention classrooms reported greater decreases from pretest to 6-month follow-up in overt aggression. Boys in the intervention classrooms had smaller increases in teacher-rated overt aggression at posttest than boys in control classrooms. Girls in intervention classrooms reported greater decreases from pretest to 6-month follow-up in relational aggression than girls in control classrooms. Study implications and directions for future research are discussed.”

Sullivan, T. N., Sutherland, K. S., Farrell, A. D., Taylor, K. A., & Doyle, S. T. (2016). Evaluation of violence prevention approaches among early adolescents: Moderating effects of disability status and gender. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 26(4) 1151–1163. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311535557>

*From the abstract:* “High prevalence rates of aggression during adolescence and associated adjustment difficulties for perpetrators and victims highlight the need for effective violence prevention programs. School-based prevention programs are advantageous as they occur in a key setting for youths' social and emotional development. The current study compared the efficacy of a combined universal violence prevention approach that included individual-level skill-building (i.e., lessons from Second Step) and school environment (i.e., Olweus Bullying Prevention Program; OBPP) interventions to OBPP alone. Participants were 231 sixth, seventh, and eighth graders (ages 11–15; M = 12.6, SD = 1.0) in middle school (48% male, 67% African American). A total of 14 classrooms were randomly assigned to the combined intervention (seven) or OBPP only comparison (seven) condition, split evenly across grades. Intervention effects were moderated by disability status and gender. Among students without disabilities those who received the combined intervention reported greater increases in anger regulation coping skills than those in the comparison condition. In contrast, among youth with disabilities greater increases in teacher-rated social skills were found for students in the combined intervention than students in the comparison condition at posttest. Gender-moderated effects included greater decreases in teacher ratings of externalizing problems and bullying behaviors for boys in the combined intervention versus the comparison condition at posttest. Study results inform school-based violence prevention programs and are discussed along with implications.”

*REL Southwest NOTE:* What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) Rating stated, “Meets WWC standards without reservations because it is a randomized controlled trial with low attrition.”

## **Threat Assessment**

Cornell, D., Maeng, J. L., Burnette, A. G., Jia, Y., Huang, F., Konold, T., et al. (2018). Student threat assessment as a standard school safety practice: Results from a statewide implementation study. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 33(2), 213–222. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1181719>. Retrieved from <https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/features/spq-spq0000220.pdf>

*From the ERIC abstract:* “Threat assessment has been widely endorsed as a school safety practice, but there is little research on its implementation. In 2013, Virginia became the

first state to mandate student threat assessment in its public schools. The purpose of this study was to examine the statewide implementation of threat assessment and to identify how threat assessment teams distinguish serious from nonserious threats. The sample consisted of 1,865 threat assessment cases reported by 785 elementary, middle, and high schools. Students ranged from pre-K to Grade 12, including 74.4% male, 34.6% receiving special education services, 51.2% White, 30.2% Black, 6.8% Hispanic, and 2.7% Asian. Survey data were collected from school-based teams to measure student demographics, threat characteristics, and assessment results. Logistic regression indicated that threat assessment teams were more likely to identify a threat as serious if it was made by a student above the elementary grades (odds ratio 0.57; 95% lower and upper bound 0.42-0.78), a student receiving special education services (1.27; 1.00-1.60), involved battery (1.61; 1.20-2.15), homicide (1.40; 1.07-1.82), or weapon possession (4.41; 2.80-6.96), or targeted an administrator (3.55; 1.73-7.30). Student race and gender were not significantly associated with a serious threat determination. The odds ratio that a student would attempt to carry out a threat classified as serious was 12.48 (5.15-30.22). These results provide new information on the nature and prevalence of threats in schools using threat assessment that can guide further work to develop this emerging school safety practice. Impact and Implications: Virginia public schools are using threat assessment teams to prevent student violence. Based on a sample of 1,865 threat cases, this study found that teams were more likely to identify a threat as serious if the student was above the elementary grades and receiving special education services, if the threat involved battery, homicide, or weapon possession, or targeted an administrator. Although few threats were attempted, a threat judged to be serious was about 12 times more likely to be attempted than a threat not judged to be serious.”

Cornell, D., Sheras, P., Gregory, A., & Fan, X. (2009). A retrospective study of school safety conditions in high schools using the Virginia threat assessment guidelines versus alternative approaches. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 24(2), 119–129.

<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ846998>. Retrieved from

<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/1625/398cbca6cc40a84cda98ade025787677d623.pdf>

*From the ERIC abstract:* “Threat assessment has been widely recommended as a violence prevention approach for schools, but there are few empirical studies of its use. This nonexperimental study of 280 Virginia public high schools compared 95 high schools using the Virginia threat assessment guidelines (Cornell & Sheras, 2006), 131 following other (i.e., locally developed) threat assessment procedures, and 54 not using a threat assessment approach. A survey of 9th grade students in each school obtained measures of student victimization, willingness to seek help for bullying and threats of violence, and perceptions of the school climate as caring and supportive. Students in schools using the Virginia threat assessment guidelines reported less bullying, greater willingness to seek help, and more positive perceptions of the school climate than students in either of the other 2 groups of schools. In addition, schools using the Virginia guidelines had fewer long-term suspensions than schools using other threat assessment approaches. These group differences could not be attributed to school size, minority composition or socioeconomic status of the student body, neighborhood violent crime, or the extent of

security measures in the schools. Implications for threat assessment practice and research are discussed.”

Louvar Reeves, M. A., & Brock, S. E. (2017). School behavioral threat assessment and management. *Contemporary School Psychology*, 22(2), 148–162.  
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1179868>. Retrieved from  
<https://www.wsasp.org/resources/Documents/Spring%20Lecture%20Series/2018/Presentations/SchoolBehavioralThreatAssessmentReevesBrock2017.pdf>

*From the ERIC abstract:* “While schools are safer today than in years past, one act of school violence is one too many. Recent reports have conveyed the importance of schools developing and implementing protocols and procedures to prevent or mitigate school violence. To assist with this task, this article addresses behavioral threat assessment and management (BTAM) in the K-12 school setting and the school psychologist’s role in risk and threat assessment. Best practices in establishing a K-12 behavioral threat assessment and management process, including the assessment of risk factors and warning signs, identification of concerns, and follow-up interventions and monitoring are discussed. Ethical and legal considerations are also reviewed.”

### **Bullying Prevention**

Evans, C. B. R., Fraser, M. W., & Cotter, K. L. (2014). The effectiveness of school-based bullying prevention programs: A systematic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 19(5), 532–544. Retrieved from <https://www.academia.edu/35070377>

*From the abstract:* “Bullying is a social phenomenon. About 30% of school children are involved in bullying as victims, bullies, or bully/victims. The victims of bullying suffer multiple negative consequences, including poor social and academic adjustment, depression, and anxiety. This paper extends Farrington and Ttofi’s (2009) meta-analysis of controlled trials of 44 bullying interventions, which suggests that bullying programs are effective in decreasing bullying and victimization. We review controlled trials of bullying interventions published from June, 2009 through April, 2013, focusing on substantive results across 32 studies that examined 24 bullying interventions. Of the 32 articles, 17 assess both bullying and victimization, 10 assess victimization only, and 5 assess bullying only. Of the 22 studies examining bullying perpetration, 11 (50%) observed significant effects; of the 27 studies examining bullying victimization, 18 (67%) reported significant effects. Although the overall findings are mixed, the data suggest that interventions implemented outside of the United States with homogeneous samples are more successful than programs implemented in the United States, where samples tend to be more heterogeneous. Few studies have measured bullying with sufficient precision to have construct validity. Finding strong measures to assess the complex construct of bullying remains a major challenge for the field.”

Ttofi, M., & Farrington, D. (2011). Effectiveness of school-based programs to reduce bullying: A systematic and meta-analytic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 7(1), 27–56. Retrieved from  
[http://sinohacesnadasosparte.org/Download/english/02\\_METAANALISIS\\_2011.pdf](http://sinohacesnadasosparte.org/Download/english/02_METAANALISIS_2011.pdf)



*From the abstract:* “This article presents a systematic review and meta-analysis of the effectiveness of anti-bullying programs in schools. Studies were included if they evaluated the effects of an anti-bullying program by comparing an intervention group who received the program with a control group who did not. Four types of research design were included: a) randomized experiments, b) intervention-control comparisons with before-and-after measures of bullying, c) other intervention-control comparisons, and d) age-cohort designs. Both published and unpublished reports were included. All volumes of 35 journals from 1983 up to the end of May 2009 were hand-searched, as were 18 electronic databases. Reports in languages other than English were also included. A total of 622 reports concerned with bullying prevention were found, and 89 of these reports (describing 53 different program evaluations) were included in our review. Of the 53 different program evaluations, 44 provided data that permitted the calculation of an effect size for bullying or victimization. The meta-analysis of these 44 evaluations showed that, overall, school-based anti-bullying programs are effective: on average, bullying decreased by 20-23% and victimization decreased by 17-20%. Program elements and intervention components that were associated with a decrease in bullying and victimization were identified, based on feedback from researchers about the coding of 40 out of 44 programs. More intensive programs were more effective, as were programs including parent meetings, firm disciplinary methods, and improved playground supervision. Work with peers was associated with an increase in victimization. It is concluded that the time is ripe to mount a new program of research on the effectiveness of anti-bullying programs based on these findings.”

## Additional Organizations to Consult

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: Preventing School Violence –

<https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/youthviolence/schoolviolence/fastfact.html>

The site provides relevant definitions, and links to the National Centers of Excellence in Youth Violence Prevention, Striving to Reduce Youth Violence Everywhere, resources, data sources, and communication resources on school violence and prevention.

National Center for Healthy Safe Children – <https://healthysafechildren.org/>

*From the website:* “The National Center for Healthy Safe Children offers resources and technical assistance to states, tribes, territories, and local communities to promote the overall well-being of children, youth, and their families. We believe that, with the right resources and support, all communities—regardless of their ZIP code—can promote positive outcomes for children, youth, and families. ...

The team of experts and resources available through the National Center for Healthy Safe Children can help your community build and support collaborations among education, public health, behavioral health, child welfare, juvenile justice, and law enforcement.

Here’s what we offer:

- Customized support to build, implement, and evaluate school-based mental health services, comprehensive violence prevention and school safety programs.
- Customized training and technical assistance to select, implement, and evaluate evidence-based and informed programs and services.”

National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments – <https://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov/>

*From the website:* “The National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments offers information and technical assistance to states, districts, schools, institutions of higher learning, and communities focused on improving student supports and academic enrichment. We believe that with the right resources and support, educational stakeholders can collaborate to sustain safe, engaging and healthy school environments that support student academic success.

This website serves as a central location for the Center. In particular, it includes information about the Center’s training and technical assistance, products and tools, and latest research findings.”

Violence Prevention Technical Assistance Center (VPTAC) – <https://www.cdcvptac.org/>

*From the website:* “The Violence Prevention Technical Assistance Center (VPTAC) serves as a training and technical assistance (TTA) hub for all health departments and domestic violence coalitions receiving funding from the Prevention Practice and Translation Branch (PPTB) in the Division of Violence Prevention at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). VPAC’s TTA providers include PPTB staff (e.g., project and evaluation officers) and VPTAC staff at the American Institutes for Research (AIR) and Futures Without Violence.”

Although it only serves specific grantees, VPTAC could make districts more aware of funding opportunities. “VPTAC serves the following PPTB-funded recipients:

- Rape Prevention and Education (RPE) recipients in state health departments
- Essentials for Childhood recipients in state health departments

- Domestic Violence Prevention Enhancement and Leadership Through Alliances (DELTA) Impact recipients in state domestic violence coalitions
- Preventing Teen Dating and Youth Violence by Addressing Shared Risk and Protective Factors (1605) recipients in local health departments

VPTAC addresses sexual violence, child abuse and neglect, intimate partner violence (including teen dating violence), and youth violence in a coordinated fashion. The goal is to help recipients accomplish program-specific requirements and promote comprehensive, crosscutting approaches to violence prevention.”

## Methods

### Keywords and Search Strings

The following keywords and search strings were used to search the reference databases and other sources:

- prevention (“violence OR violent”)
- violence prevention and safety planning
- violence prevention and parental involvement
- violence prevention and mental health support
- violence prevention and security personnel
- violence prevention actuarial OR targeted violence risk assessment
- violence prevention (security personnel or school peace officers)
- violence prevention effects
- impact of bullying prevention programs
- threat assessment (verbal OR self-harm)
- threat assessment (bullying OR cyberbullying)
- [(“threat assessment” AND “use” OR “possession” of a weapon)]
- threat assessment and violence prevention outcomes or effects
- [(“violence prevention program outcomes” OR “effects”) AND (“threat assessment”)]
- effectiveness of security personnel OR school peace officers)

### Databases and Resources

We searched [ERIC](#) for relevant, peer-reviewed research references. ERIC is a free online library of more than 1.8 million citations of education research sponsored by the Institute of Education Sciences (IES). Additionally, we searched the [What Works Clearinghouse](#).

### Reference Search and Selection Criteria

When we were searching and reviewing resources, we considered the following criteria:

- *Date of the publication:* References and resources published from 2005 to present, were included in the search and review.

- *Search priorities of reference sources:* Search priority is given to study reports, briefs, and other documents that are published and/or reviewed by IES and other federal or federally funded organizations, academic databases, including ERIC, EBSCO databases, JSTOR database, PsychInfo, PsychArticle, and Google Scholar.
- *Methodology:* The following methodological priorities/considerations were given in the review and selection of the references: (a) study types—randomized control trials, quasi-experiments, correlational studies, descriptive data analyses, literature reviews, mixed methods analyses, and so forth; (b) target population, samples (representativeness of the target population, sample size, volunteered or randomly selected, and so forth), study duration, and so forth; and (c) limitations, generalizability of the findings and conclusions, and so forth.

---

This memorandum is one in a series of quick-turnaround responses to specific questions posed by stakeholders in the Southwest Region (Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas), which is served by the Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Southwest at AIR. This memorandum was prepared by REL Southwest under a contract with the U.S. Department of Education’s Institute of Education Sciences (IES), Contract ED-IES-91990018C0002, administered by AIR. Its content does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of IES or the U.S. Department of Education nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.